

October 2, 2007

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING HELD OCTOBER 2, 2007

A Work Session Meeting of the City Council of the City of Hopewell, Virginia, was held Tuesday, October 2, 2007, at 6:00 PM in the City Council Chambers, Municipal Building, 300 North Main Street, Hopewell, Virginia.

PRESENT: Steven R. Taylor, Mayor
Brenda S. Pelham, Vice Mayor
Christina J. Luman-Bailey, Councilor
Curtis W. Harris, Councilor
Kenneth B. Emerson, Councilor
E. Randy Sealey, Councilor
N. Gregory Cuffey, Councilor

Edwin C. Daley, City Manager
Edwin N. Wilmot, City Attorney
Ann M. Romano, City Clerk

Mayor Taylor opened the meeting at 6:00 PM. (He announced that Councilor Cuffey would arrive at approximately 6:30 PM due to a prior engagement.) Roll call was taken as follows:

Mayor Taylor	-	present
Vice Mayor Pelham	-	present
Councilor Bailey	-	ABSENT (arrived 6:10 PM)
Councilor Harris	-	present
Councilor Emerson	-	present
Councilor Sealey	-	present
Councilor Cuffey	-	ABSENT (arrived at 6:50 PM)

FINANCIAL OVERVIEW - DAVENPORT & COMPANY - ELESTEEN HAGER, DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

City Manager Daley introduced the first item of business, the Financial Overview from Davenport & Company. Courtney Rogers, with Davenport & Company LLC briefed City Council on the "*Financial Observations for Fiscal Year 2007- October 2, 2007*" (copy filed in the City Clerk's Office. Mr. Rogers stated that the report is in two sections; 1 - Overview/Historical Cash-Flow Trends, and 2 - Debt Capacity Analysis.

1. Overview/Historical Cash-Flow Trends
 - A. The City's bond rating from Moody's is A2; S&P is A; and Fitch is A+.
 - B. Review Major Cash-Flow and Budget Related Trends of the City.
 - C. Initial Financial Review/Update of the City in Anticipation of Developing the FY 2009 Budget and Multi-Year Capital Improvements Program.
 - D. Determine the City's Debt Capacity (*i.e. Ability to Responsibly Take-on Additional Indebtedness over the Next 5-10 years*)
2. Debt Capacity Analysis
 - A. Existing Tax Supported Debt Analysis
 - B. Existing Tax Supported Debt Service
 - C. Impact on Key Debt Ratios -
 - 1) Debt Service vs. Expenditures

2) Debt vs. Total Assessed Value

Key Observations

- The City's Debt Capacity after incorporating the takeout of the 2004 BANs in FY 2010 is approximately \$10 million by the end of the Decade.
- "Debt Capacity" as noted above means the Level of Additional Indebtedness that the City can take on without Dedicating Additional (*i.e. New*) Revenues from the Budget.
- The Cost of Indebtedness beyond what is Calculated Above:
- In the future (*i.e. 2010*) 1¢ (one cent) on the Real Estate Tax Rate, assuming 3% annual Real Estate Assessed Value Growth, will be approximately equal to \$120,000. (*Assumes value of one cent on the real estate tax rate as of FY 2008 (\$112.550 with 3.0% annual growth.*)
- This \$120,000 translates into roughly \$1.7 million of Borrowing Capacity. (*Assumes 25 year amortization at 5.0% interest rate.*)
- The General Fund has experienced two solid years of financial results allowing the Undesignated Fund Balance to increase.
- Positive General Fund Financial Results and Increased Reserve Levels were specifically noted by Moody's as factors for removing their "Negative Outlook."
- Year-to-Year growth of several major city revenues has been sporadic but generally upward trending.
- The drop-down in the City's existing tax-supported Debt Service provides the opportunity to strategically incorporate the permanent takeout of the 2004 BANs without placing undue cash-flow pressure on the General Fund.

DISCUSSION: The City has a strong fund balance; it needs the fund balance to pay the bills. Without the fund balance, the City could not act quickly should an economic development opportunity become available. Regarding the Debt Capacity the \$20M bonds are included in the \$42.2M. The 2.13% Schools growth does not reflect the true figures. The City's Real Estate Tax Rate is \$1.09 not \$1.12 as stated in the report. Guidelines for future growth: remain conservative. Once revenues come in, try to put it aside and let it build up. Council needs to focus on professional, commercial, and industrial development. Then it can shift to owner-occupied development and then finally, rental development.

SCHOOLS CONSTRUCTION COMMITTEE

Avon Miles, Chairman of the Hopewell School Board, and member of the Schools Construction Committee (*Schools Facilities Committee*) addressed Council with an update on the School Bus Garage.

In 2005 discussions were started about the need for a bus garage for school buses. City Council and the School Board reached a consensus to create a facility as an addition at the current City Garage at the Public Works Department. In March of 2006 the committee reached consensus on the design of the building. School personnel would be located in the building. In May building specifications were brought in. It was previously decided that the Schools would pay \$500,000 and the City would pay \$500,000 for the new building. Plans were sent out at the end of May concerning construction. On July 9, 2006 the invitation to bid went out. Subsequently there was site work, submission of bids, and construction began in September. However, there had been delays in that happening. The Committee met again on April 25, 2007. By that time there was a plan for construction. By June 28, 2007, it came to the School Board's attention that the construction plans had been altered without having gone to the committee. There was a meeting with School and City Staff members to discuss the conflict. The committee was at a loss as to how to proceed. The School Board did not realize what was going on. They did not know how to proceed with this project. Dr. Odom and Dr. Daley have discussed the issue.

October 2, 2007

Dr. Daley provided the following report:

School Construction Committee

City Council and the City School Board approved a committee proposal for consolidated vehicle maintenance facilities in 2006. There was no written agreement on this matter. Committee members thought this was to be a joint facility with space for School Transportation offices, a training room and a women's restroom. City staff thought the city would hire two additional mechanics and provide vehicle maintenance services for City Schools.

During the budget preparation process, Council directed that the two School Bus Mechanic positions should continue to be school positions for an additional year.

There was no provision for School Transportation offices, a training room or a women's restroom in the facility that will soon be ready for occupancy. The plans for this facility were not shared with the School Construction Committee.

The transfer of \$500,000 from the school fund for the new facility at City yards has not been made.

There are several options available:

- A. Modify the new facility to meet School needs at a cost of \$150,000. The City would also need to purchase property to be used as a City bus lot for an estimated \$100,000.
- B. Purchase another facility that can be used for this and other purposes by the Schools for an estimated \$500,000 plus \$100,000 for initial repairs. Additional repairs will be required as the proposed facility is believed to be structurally sound but needs other improvements. A local industry is interested in this property and may be willing to lease it to City Schools for 5-10 years. There is no option on this property as the price became very volatile when the owner learned of possible City interest.
- C. Look for another site.

DISCUSSION: It is unclear who decided to alter the plans. The original design of the bus garage was for two offices on the ground floor. The building has been built. Dr. Daley and Dr. Odom asked Council how to proceed from here. (1) There is no office for School Transportation Personnel. (2) There is no Training Room; the space has been designated for parts storage. (3) There is no Ladies' Room in the building. Council agreed that someone made the unauthorized change to the plan and it must be determined who that is. The Schools feel that there is no place to move the School personnel to. Offices are needed for the Supervisors. When changes were discussed, they were not brought back to the Committee. It was then discovered that there were some issues about School personnel coming into the building from the School System. The Schools System alleges that management and the Public Works Garage did not want the School Supervisors in the building. That was not what the School Board, or the committee, understood before the building was built. The problem was office space for management in the building. It was suggested to put the two operations together to do the same thing to save money. From the beginning the plan was to have space for the office personnel who would have to move out of the old building across the street from Public Works. The Mayor expressed his preference for Option #1 in the City Manager's report, at \$150,000. This venture must be viewed as a partnership. Fleet management would have to come under one manager. But office personnel would not report to a City supervisor. The building provides no housing for the School's Management Personnel. Where will the drivers be able to assemble? The Schools are not discussing the matter with City Management and would be hesitant to send School Supervisors in there because it would be a bad situation. According to the Schools, the original intent was for this to be a joint operation. The primary cost savings would be two

October 2, 2007

School mechanics to the City side. According to the Schools, plans were for a joint facility for School Management and staging busses in that area; it has always been for Management and School bus drivers and the City would co-exist. If the Schools had known originally, that they would not have management in the new bus garage, they would not have made this agreement. It did not come up until recently. This was the biggest cost savings for both Schools and the City. School Management must be located with the School mechanic and drivers. The School System has doubts about moving School personnel into that building at this time.

Councilor Bailey is on the Schools Construction Committee. She confirmed what Mr. Miles and Dr. Odom said. She reported that hostility was evident in at least one of their meetings.

The personnel issue involves two School mechanics, one Director, one Assistant Director and about 25 bus drivers that meet with the Director and Assistant Director on a regular basis. That includes bus driver training.

The City Manager identified three components of the issue:

1. Two School mechanics: Should they be working at this garage, and should they be working for the Public Works Department or for the Schools? They are in the School Budget and so are their benefits. Who supervises them on a daily basis?
2. Should the Director and Assistant Director be housed in this garage or elsewhere?
3. Should the busses and bus drivers gather at the City yards or elsewhere?

The School Board is presently supervising the two School mechanics. After the one-year transition period, the two mechanics would work for the City. The two School mechanics being under School supervision, while everyone else was being trained, is also a problem. The real problem is allowing School mechanics to have keys to the building because there were tools, etc., in the building that belonged to other mechanics (Public Works). There should not be a trust issue with the School mechanics.

Councilor Bailey quoted a comment allegedly made during the hostile Schools Construction Committee meeting, *"I do not want anyone that does not answer to me to have access to that building."*

There is no room at the Public Works yard to train 25 School bus drivers right now. It would be difficult to have a training session.

Mayor Taylor asked City Manager Daley and Superintendent Odom to manage the situation; to create peace and harmony. He opposed spending an additional \$450,000 just because some people cannot get along. Perhaps the mezzanine can be enclosed to provide office space.

A few years ago there was a Council/Staff/School tour of the present School garage facility and the Public Works yard. Councilor Harris is also a member of the committee. He missed one meeting; the alleged hostile meeting. The City Manager and the School Superintendent should revert to the original plan. If not, then we have a new venture. He was appalled to know that some of the plan could not work because Public Works was not in favor of it. The Public Works Department is under the City Manager. The School Superintendent runs the School System. He asked that they work together and report back to City Council on their progress.

The present location of the School bus garage is the staging site for the busses. They are currently renting that facility. Carter G. Woodson Middle School would be the second option. The owner of the present bus garage property is willing to sell the property. There are no other options closer to Public Works. Currently all bus driver training is held at the metal School bus garage, which is inadequate.

October 2, 2007

Change is adaptable to the original plan. It would cost \$150,000 to modify the building, and \$100,000 to purchase the lot for the School busses. But the City Manager felt unsure that the \$150,000 could not be put to better use. The new building, thus far, has cost \$950,000+.

Mr. Miles indicated that the School System would need to take a serious look at whatever we do from now on; there is a need to be cautious. There are many factors at play. He wants to make sure that it is done correctly and with the best outcome for all involved.

Both sides - the Schools and the City - should be allowed to work on this issue. Find out what went wrong, and deal with the working atmosphere and attitudes. Council will hear what they have to say when they come back to Council with the recommendations. He wishes for the City Manager and the Superintendent to work it out and tell Council about it later. Councilor Harris was not in favor of discussing this again in open session.

2008 LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM - HERBERT BRAGG, PAC & LEGISLATIVE LIAISON

In anticipation of this years 2008 General Assembly Session and the Fort Lee Base Realignment & Closure (BRAC) expansion, Herbert Bragg, PAC & Legislative Liaison, is preparing the City of Hopewell's Annual Legislative Program for presentation to State Legislators. By taking a proactive approach to issues that are considered by the Virginia General Assembly, City Officials and the City Administration strive to improve the City's ability to deliver quality services. He distributed a worksheet for Council's remarks.

He encouraged Council to submit general ideas, suggestions or specific legislative proposals for consideration in the Legislative Program. Council's recommendations will be considered in a draft document submitted by the City administrative staff to City Council. The deadline for submission to Mr. Bragg's attention is October 5, 2007.

Mr. Bragg reviewed the 2007 Legislative Program and last years priorities.

1. The Beacon Theatre was # 1 on our listing.
2. Human Services Space Needs was # 2 (this consisted of space needs for the Department of Social Services, CSA, and the Health Department).
3. Shared Services (consisting of the jail, detention centers and health department) was # 3. We support the state assuming 100% responsibility for these programs.
4. Increased funding for Comprehensive Services Act (CSA) was # 4. The City supported incentives to eliminate the distinction between the base budget and the supplemental budget.
5. Emergency Operations Center/Fire Station # 1 was # 5 on our listing. We requested from the 2007 General Assembly \$250, 000 dollars for the purpose of conducting a feasibility study for these two projects however, we were not successful.
6. Auxiliary Grant Program was # 6 (this included programs for the elderly, the blind and disabled who live in an Adult Care Facility.) We support legislation that allows the state to assume 100% funding for these programs.
7. Social Services programs were # 7 consisting of (1) Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF); (2) Data Collection; (3) At-Risk Youth Funding; and (4) Local Administration of programs.
8. Fort Lee Base Re-alignment & Closure (BRAC) Expansion Project was # 8 on our listing. The City supported the Central Virginia BRAC Working Group Budget Recommendations as well as Crater District Planning Commission Initiatives. These recommendations included Route 35/Route 144 Intersection and Route 460 Expansion Project.

October 2, 2007

9. Public Libraries were # 9 on our listing. The City supported the state's Joint Legislative and Review (JLAR) team recommendations to fund 6M dollars in FY 08. This recommendation was also supported by the Virginia Library Association.
10. Increased funding for HB 599 funding formula which deals with public safety issues and funding programs for public safety initiatives. This also includes funding for Youth Health Programs, Gang Violence and Parks Safety.

Mr. Bragg requested Council guidance. He was a member of the delegation that briefed Congressman Randy Forbes on October 1, 2007 here in Hopewell. He requested that Council let him know how to rate the list in order of importance. Regarding last years requests, funding for RC&D was sent to Southwestern Virginia.

Councilor Cuffey thanked Mr. Bragg for his efforts. He did attend the General Assembly several times last year. In talking with Delegate McEachin last year, he was told that Hopewell should specifically (1) go to the General Assembly early; and (2) be more specific and detailed in the requests.

Council was asked to let Mr. Bragg know when they wanted to meet. Mayor Taylor asked him to put the package together to go to City Council before it can be authorized to go to the General Assembly.

Councilor Emerson would have preferred to receive the worksheet about a month ago rather than three days before the due date.

The 2008 Legislative Agenda should be included on the Agenda for the City Council meeting on November 13, 2007. Mr. Bragg will be sending a list from Delegate Forbes, in priority order, to Council.

DOWNTOWN PARTNERSHIP

City Manager Daley asked City Council what their intent is with the Economic Development Fund money. Mayor Taylor asked that Finance Director Elesteen Hager bring them up to date.

Mr. Hager explained that when Steve Herbert was Interim City Manager he submitted his amended budget with the Downtown Manager/Economic Development position under the City Manager. Money was put in the City Manager's budget to fund the position out of the City Manager's Office. When the budget process was started, one group was trying to get the Main Street Program started and needed financial support. The dollar amount of the City's contribution was unclear. The City Manager's budget items were removed. Through the budget debates, Council made progress. Council put money in the budget. If it happened, they can have it totally autonomously. If the Main Street Program did not happen, they could do small programs downtown. They could apply for 501 (c) 3 status with their own staff, etc. If that happened the City would make an appropriation to support it, as had been done with the library, until they became self sufficient.

Dr. Daley has seen the enthusiasm generated by the Hopewell 2007 Committee. He would hire a person to work on Hopewell 2008 and work with the partnership. When they become a 501 (c) 3 entity, Council can decide how to fund them. This would continue the activity downtown. For the time being, the position would be split between the City Manager's office and the Department of Recreation and Parks; similar to the Events Coordinator for the 2007 Committee. There was a question of whether or not the position could also work with the Downtown business owners and provide the assistance they need in developing business plans. The Main Street Program funnels this to another party. That person could help make those connections.

October 2, 2007

According to Councilor Bailey, one of the things that the State looks at is what is going on locally. DHCD operates the Main Street Program. Council voted 5/2 to adopt the Main Street Program. That showed commitment to the State. When we allocated \$50,000 on May 30, 2007, and adopted it as part of the budget, that showed the financial support. They came to Hopewell in August 2007. Dr. Daley is on the Board of the Main Street organization in Hopewell. There will be a training session at the end of October or early November. DHCD, with their expertise, will come to do the training here in Hopewell. Part of the formula is that the Downtown Coordinator, rather than answering to City staff, answers to the Board of the Main Street Organization. The Board of the Main Street Organization includes our City Manager. Tevya Griffin, City Planner, is also part of the organization, but is not on the board. The board also includes other stakeholders in the community. The John Randolph Medical Center (JRMC) is a member. Since there is some confusion, Councilor Bailey suggested that a Work Session be scheduled for the Board Members of the Downtown Partnership to explain to City Council what they have already adopted and what they will continue to adopt. We have shown our commitment with our Resolution and by allocating money. The City of Harrisonburg thrives with their Main Street Program. Their Board includes the Director of Development and a Council member. It would be good to have someone from the ARLS library on the board also. Their Downtown Coordinator is paid as a City employee. That creates trust and a link between the Downtown stakeholders and the City.

Mayor Taylor raised the issue of the make up of the Downtown Partnership. He read the membership as listed on the roster: Councilor Christina Bailey; Bernie Boone-CEO, JRMC; City Manager-Edwin C. Daley; Tina Hazelwood; Katherine Podlewski; and Cassandra Spencer-Nu 2 U (Downtown business owner); and Joan S. Thompson-BB&T (resigned). At the time the committee was formed:

*“From the City Council meeting of November 11, 2003: A Resolution reorganizing the **Downtown Partnership Committee** and making two initial appointments - WHEREAS, the Council of the City of Hopewell, by Resolution approved on **January 14, 2003**, as part of the Downtown Plan submitted by HyettPalma, Inc., formed a **committee to address downtown revitalization concerns**; and WHEREAS, Council also approved the **formation of a similar committee** as part of its Budget Resolution, passed on May 27 2003; and WHEREAS, Council, at its Advance of Saturday, November 8, 2003, revisited the subject of a committee to consider and address downtown revitalization, and is now in a position to **reorganize the committee and make initial appointments** to it. NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Hopewell, Virginia, that the committee originally established pursuant to the Budget Resolution and the Resolution approving the Downtown Plan be **reorganized and named the Downtown Partnership Committee**; that the committee be considered an **ad-hoc committee**, with no definite terms for its members; and that the committee be **comprised of seven members**, to wit, one member of City Council, one downtown property owner, one downtown business owner, one representative of City Administration, one representative from Hopewell Preservation, Inc., and two citizens. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that **Mayor Vanessa Justice and the City Manager or his designee be appointed to serve as the Council and Administration representatives to the committee, respectively.**”*

Councilor Bailey reported that they have broadened the membership. In January 2007 they moved from a “committee” to the “board” and they have invited new members to join, but not as board members. It is no longer a committee; it is now an organization. She indicated that former Interim City Manager, Steve Herbert, was aware, and former City Manager, Alan Archer, told her a year ago that was necessary.

Mayor Taylor asked the City Attorney whether or not a City Council appointed committee can amend itself without Council approval. From a legal standpoint, the Council appointed an Ad Hoc committee and designated seven people as its membership (see above). (The City Attorney responded that

October 2, 2007

they cannot dissolve themselves without resigning.) Council established that committee. If this Ad Hoc committee has dissolved itself, perhaps we should change that and look at this again.

Councilor Sealey favors hiring someone for downtown. But he has a problem with any City-paid employee being under the direction of a citizen group. Council sets policy, but the City Manager is over all of the City employees.

Councilor Cuffey felt that these were two entirely separate issues. Since the designation, we have now achieved Affiliate status. It is separate and different from the Downtown Partnership. Monies must be allocated to show the City's support, but it should not be run by the City. If it achieves its 501 (c) 3 status, it would be a separate entity anyway. The Ad Hoc committee is still in place until Council dissolves it.

Councilor Harris agrees that these are two separate entities. The allocation was for the purpose of the Main Street Program. We do not have a foundation to allocate funds to. The allocation considered during the budget process is still in the General Fund. We cannot operate that way, business-wise. Council has the responsibility of appointing committees. We are trying to make some things happen in Downtown Hopewell. He has a problem dealing with the activity of Council in terms of power. No one can arbitrarily take the position to change a committee and call it something else.

Mr. Wilmot stated that Councilor Bailey's point here is that this was originally a Council committee, but it also happens to be a private board with expanded membership. If these individuals, on their own, want to form another committee, they may. But, they still are members of the Council appointed committee. They are separate. A City Council committee cannot be changed without City Council approval.

This committee is requesting funds from the City. Mr. Wilmot explained that it is not unusual for private groups to request funds from the City. There is nothing illegal. It would be helpful if they were a corporation, or a 501 (c) 3, etc. But there is no requirement.

Dr. Daley stated that once this new group files and becomes a 501 (c) 3, then the City has someone to send a check to if they want to. Until then, the City would be giving money to an individual. There is not presently anyone to give it to. He does not want an employee working for a committee that is not a City committee.

Councilor Emerson stated that the commitment has been made for downtown. He thinks that employee should be made part of the Ad Hoc committee. Make it active again. Reappoint that board with downtown ownership responsibilities. Get that going again because the street scape is almost done.

Councilor Bailey indicated that they do not have to be a 501 (c) 3 to receive money. They can become incorporated and have a director who can open a bank account and who signs checks. The bank can use the director's Social Security Number as the Tax ID Number. She voiced her disappointment in that after July 1, 2007, when the new budget became effective, she began talking with Dr. Daley about the Downtown Partnership. She, Dr. Daley, and Kathleen Vincent were placed on the organization committee. During those discussions, Dr. Daley suggested that the City should act as the fiscal agent. However, the Main Street Organization of the City should be the one to whom the Downtown Coordinator answers. There must be trust between the Downtown stakeholders and the City. She was surprised to hear the City Manager say that he cannot wait. In January 2007 the committee decided to enlarge the membership and become the Main Street Organization. That was after Councilor Bailey attended a workshop in Richmond with Interim City Manager, Steve Herbert and Tevya Griffin, City Planner. At their next Downtown Partnership Committee meeting in January, they said they would

October 2, 2007

enlarge the organization, as required by the DHCD. If the Ad Hoc committee still exists, they will go ahead and resign so that there will not be a non-active Council committee. There would be no need for committee meeting announcements anyway, under the FOIA.

The Ad Hoc committee acted in a dual role. Now they have transformed into the Downtown Partnership.

Mayor Taylor stated that four Councilors (a consensus) voiced their opinions that the current money should go to the new Downtown Partnership. He suggested that the City Manager should work up a decision package for the next Council meeting (October 23, 2007), plan for the next Work Session, and add to the Downtown Partnership roster exactly who is on it.

PARK LAND ACQUISITION - FEDERAL LANDS TO PARKS PROGRAM

Jo Turek, Director of the Recreation & Parks Department, addressed Council regarding the Federal Land to Parks Program.

Two of the City's park properties were obtained through a Federal Lands to Parks Program. Those two sites consist of Atwater Park, with 21.9 acres, and Atwater Soccer Complex, with 23.99 acres. When Anchor Point was developed, a portion of the park site from Atwater Park was used for the main entrance to the Anchor Point Site. The acreage used from the park was 1.87 acres.

As the City of Hopewell works with the Cameron Landing site and the need for the entrance to that area, a portion of the Atwater Soccer Complex is being used for that entrance. The acreage used from the park was 2.86. Therefore, the total acreage used is 4.73.

When the City obtained those two parks through the Federal Lands to Parks Program, the agreement was clear that the acreage must be maintained. Therefore, another recreational site with that acreage must be designated, and then the Federal Lands to Parks Program must be notified of the exchange which is allowable by the agreement. The Department of Recreation and Parks must still provide a boundary survey, obtain an appraisal, site assessment, provide location map of all park sites, as well as adding a sign to the park site showing the designation as a Federal Lands to Park Program, once all is done and approved.

After reviewing City-owned property, the Department of Recreation and Parks recommended King Court, which has acreage of 7.66 acres in total, as the site for the exchange of the 4.73 acres. Kings Court is located near the Landfill and this site is best suited for this designation.

Ms. Turek asked for Council approval to notify the United States Department of the Interior, which oversees the Federal Lands to Parks Program, of Council's approval to exchange the acreage, and allow City administration to move forward through the necessary steps.

Councilor Harris announced that Kings Court is in his ward (#2) and that he would like to see the property.

Mayor Taylor thanked Ms. Turek for her efforts. He has received many compliments on the City's parks and fields.

Ms. Turek reported on another small parcel of land (0.4 acres), owned by Kathryn Hunter, that is near the Hopewell City Marina which abuts the water company. VDOT gave the City of Hopewell the approval to park under the bridge. That small portion of land should also be acquired by the City of

October 2, 2007

Hopewell, thereby allowing more space and the Department of Recreation and Parks can ensure that it is maintained. Ms. Hunter has indicated her approval to sell the land to the City of Hopewell for One Thousand Dollars (\$1,000.00).

It was suggested that Harbor Fund dollars be allocated for this purchase and any other expenses that may be needed to complete this transaction. Ms. Turek sought Council approval to purchase the acreage, and allow City administration to move forward through the necessary steps. Council approved by consensus.

ADJOURN

At 9:11 PM **motion** was made by Councilor Sealey, and seconded by Councilor Harris, to adjourn the meeting. Upon the roll call, the vote resulted:

Councilor Emerson	-	yes
Councilor Sealey	-	yes
Mayor Taylor	-	yes
Vice Mayor Pelham	-	yes
Councilor Cuffey	-	yes
Councilor Bailey	-	yes
Councilor Harris	-	yes

Steven R. Taylor, Mayor

Ann M. Romano, City Clerk